

REMARKS

Claim Status:

Claims 1-12, 14-25 and 27-51 are pending in the present application. Claims 21-24 and 30-51 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 13 and 26 are canceled without prejudice.

Art-Based Rejection

Claims 1-20 and 25-29 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Sehr (US Patent No. 6,999,936) in view of Wu U.S. Patent No. 6,748,533).

We respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 in view of Sehr and Wu.

Claim 1 recites – in combination with other features – verifying a bearer's age when: i) the first digital data indicates that the bearer is at least as old as a predetermined age, and ii) the second digital data and the third digital data correspond.

Both conditions i and ii must be satisfied in order to *verify a bearer's age*.

While Sehr may verify an age of a visitor (col. 10, lines 13-15 and col. 20, lines 21-27) it does not premise this decision on both: i) when the first digital data indicates that the bearer is at least as old as a predetermined age, and ii) when the second digital data and the third digital data correspond.

Wu is not relied upon for these features, nor is it understood provide such teachings.

Claim 1 stands ready for allowance.

Claim 12 in view of Sehr and Wu.

Amended claim 12 recites – in combination with other features – decoding the scan data to obtain the first set of information included in the digital watermark, *the first set of information including a concatenated string of data comprising an age indicator and additional data*, wherein the digital watermark is embedded in the identification

document through hidden changes to data representing one or more items carried by the identification document.

The Sehr document mentions a birth date (col. 10, lines 8-14) and an age (col. 20, lines 23-27), but not a digital watermark carrying a first set of information including a concatenated string of data comprising an age indicator and additional data.

Wu is not relied upon for these features.

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 14 and 15 in view of Sehr and Wu

Claim 14 recites a second set of information embedded in the identification document of claim 12. The second set of information corresponds to a third set of information that is printed on the identification document. The second set of information comprises an *index for accessing a data repository*.

Regarding the features of claim 14, Sehr at Col. 6, lines 46-50, is cited in the Office Action, but this passage merely discusses storing biometrics in a database. Col. 11, lines 8-10 is also cited, but this passage discusses capturing and storing a visitor's fingerprint in a visitor card. Finally Wu at Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 8, line 3 is cited. But this passage discusses storing different information (i.e., identification portion, name of country or state, photograph, passport number, name of person, issuance information, personal particulars and biometric data).

We do not see any mention of a second set of information comprising an *index for accessing a data repository* in the long list of cited passages.

Claim 14 should be allowed.

Claim 15 recites that the *index comprises a hash* of the third set of information that is printed on the identification document. (Recall from claim 14 that the index is for accessing a data repository.)

The cited Wu passage (col. 8, lines 22-30) discusses encrypting a biometric invariant feature with a hash. But this hash is not understood to be an index for accessing a data repository.

Claim 15 stand ready for allowance as well.

Claim 18 in view of Sehr and Wu

Claim 18 recites the first set of information comprises two or more random bits. The Office Action refers to the “generate random pattern” step of Fig. 6 as teaching these features. We respectfully disagree.

Claim 18’s “first set of information” is like a message, and if mapped to Fig. 6 would be more like the biometric information 600 or the other appending information 602. Information 600 and 602 are encrypted and provided to a random pattern generator. But, as a result, the biometric information 600 and the other appending information 602 do not then include “two or more random bits”. We submit that the random pattern is more akin to a watermark carrier signal, and not to an actual message.

Thus, Wu is not understood to teach or suggest adding two or more random bits to a first set of information.

Claim 18 stands ready for allowance.

Claim 20 in view of Sehr and Wu

Claim 20 recites – in combination with other features – that a combination of random bits and the date of birth decrease likelihood of overlapping birth dates, while maintaining an anonymous audit clue.

We see no mention of “maintaining an anonymous audit clue,” in combination with the other claim features, in the cited passages.

Indeed, Sehr at Col. 7, lines 45-48 expressly *teaches away* from an anonymous audit clue (“This audit trail establish the concept of non-repudiation with the help of a “**Who** did What-When-Where” recording.”) (emphasis added). Similarly, the teachings of Col. 15, lines 10-19 would maintain records of visitors.

The cited Wu passage at col. 11, lines 15-18 (and fig. 6), says nothing regarding maintaining an anonymous audit clue, in combination with the other claim features.

Claim 20 stands ready for allowance.

Claim 25 in view of Sehr and Wu.

Claim 25 recites (in combination with other features) that neither the data corresponding to the second field nor the reduced-bit representation, betray the identity of the authorized bearer of the identification document.

The proposed combination of Sehr and Wu are not understood to render such a combination obvious. For example, Sehr at Col. 33, lines 10-30 would require a person's biometric, which will certainly betray an identity of an authorized bearer of the identification document. Sehr at Col. 20, lines 22-27 does not address these features either.

Claim 25 stands ready for allowance.

(Claim 25 is amended to remove the steganographic embedding features, which will broaden some aspects of this claim.)

Remaining Claims

We respectfully submit that the remaining claim recite patentable combinations. Reconsideration is requested.

Conclusion

We respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 503-469-4685 if any questions remain.

Date: October 18, 2007

Customer No. 23735

Phone: 503-465-4685

FAX: 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By: /Steven W. Stewart, Reg. No. 45,133/

Steven W. Stewart

Registration No. 45,133